	DAT405 Introduction to Data Science and Al Assignment 4: Spam classification using Naïve Bayes Francisco Boudagh (13 h) Jakob Engström (13 h) 2023-04-26 The three folders containing emails are downloaded manually.				
In [23]:	<pre>import email.pol from email impor</pre>	nails from easy_ham, hard_ha icy it message_from_string	am and spam. Do you thir	nk you would be able to classify the emails just by inspection? How do you think a succesful model can learn the difference between the different classes of emails?	
	<pre>import seaborn a import pandas as import numpy as import os def extract_emai</pre>	<pre>port matplotlib.pyplot as plt port seaborn as sns port pandas as pd port numpy as np port os f extract_emails(file, class_name): emails_list = []</pre>			
	with open(if f: conten emails	<pre>os.listdir(directory): os.path.join(directory, at = f.read()</pre>		<pre>in-1') as f: content, policy=email.policy.default), 'content': content, 'class': class_name})</pre>	
	<pre>df_eh = extract_ df_hh = extract_ df_s = extract_e # combining easy</pre>	emails(['easy_ham'], 'elemails(['hard_ham'], 'helemails(['hard_ham'], 'helemails(['spam'], 'spam')) Tham, hard ham and spam Loncat([df_eh, df_hh, elemails floorente flo	ham') ham')		
		', + len(df_hh))	tterns manually		
Out[23]:	df_s.sample(5) Easy ham: 2551 Hard ham: 250 Spam: 501 email				
	pelivered-To, Received, Received, Received, Message-Id, From, To, Cc, Subject, Sender, MIME- Version, Date,	(single-drop); Mon, 26 Aug 2002 ready to bare for you!\nSe	15:41:57 +0100 (IST)\nRecei ender: Tawnee Stone <tawnee Sensation is ready to</tawnee 	2\nReturn-Path: <tawneemail@yahoo.com>\nDelivered-To: zzzz@localhost.example.com\nReceived: from localhost (localhost [127.0.0.1])\n\tby phobos.labs.example.com (Postfix) with ESMTP id D96FE47CC8\n\tfor <zzzz@localhost>; Mon, 26 Aug 20 ved: from proxy.foxberry.com ([203.238.133.122]) by\n dogma.slashnull.org (8.11.6/8.11.6) with SMTP id g7PBWaZ11279 for\n <webmaster@efi.ie>; Sun, 25 Aug 2002 12:32:37 +0100\nMessage-ld: <200208251132.g7PBWaZ11279@dogma.slashnull.org (8.11.6/8.11.6) with SMTP id g7PBWaZ11279 for\n <webmaster@efi.ie>; Sun, 25 Aug 2002 12:32:37 +0100\nMessage-ld: <200208251132.g7PBWaZ11279@dogma.slashnull.org (8.11.6/8.11.6) with SMTP id g7PBWaZ11279 for\n <webmaster@efi.ie>; Sun, 25 Aug 2002 12:32:37 +0100\nMessage-ld: <200208251132.g7PBWaZ11279@dogma.slashnull.org (8.11.6/8.11.6) with SMTP id g7PBWaZ11279 for\n <webmaster@efi.ie>; Sun, 25 Aug 2002 12:32:37 +0100\nMessage-ld: <200208251132.g7PBWaZ11279@dogma.slashnull.org (8.11.6/8.11.6) with SMTP id g7PBWaZ11279 for\n <webmaster@efi.ie>; Sun, 25 Aug 2002 12:32:37 +0100\nMessage-ld: <200208251132.g7PBWaZ11279@dogma.slashnull.org (8.11.6/8.11.6) with SMTP id g7PBWaZ11279 for\n <webmaster@efi.ie>; Sun, 25 Aug 2002 12:32:37 +0100\nMessage-ld: <200208251132.g7PBWaZ11279@dogma.slashnull.org (8.11.6/8.11.6) with SMTP id g7PBWaZ11279 for\n <webmaster@efi.ie>; Sun, 25 Aug 2002 12:32:37 +0100\nMessage-ld: <200208251132.g7PBWaZ11279@dogma.slashnull.org (8.11.6/8.11.6) with SMTP id g7PBWaZ11279 for\n <webmaster@efi.ie>; Sun, 25 Aug 2002 12:32:37 +0100\nMessage-ld: <200208251132.g7PBWaZ11279@dogma.slashnull.org (8.11.6/8.11.6) with SMTP id g7PBWaZ11279 for\n <webmaster@efi.ie>; Sun, 25 Aug 2002 12:32:37 +0100\nMessage-ld: <200208251132.g7PBWaZ11279@dogma.slashnull.org (8.11.6/8.11.6) with SMTP id g7PBWaZ11279 for\n <webmaster@efi.ie>; Sun, 25 Aug 2002 12:32:37 +0100\nn </webmaster@efi.ie></webmaster@efi.ie></webmaster@efi.ie></webmaster@efi.ie></webmaster@efi.ie></webmaster@efi.ie></webmaster@efi.ie></webmaster@efi.ie></webmaster@efi.ie></webmaster@efi.ie></zzzz@localhost></tawneemail@yahoo.com>	
	Version, Date, X-Mailer, Content-Type] [Return-Path, Delivered-To, Received, Received, Received, Received,	Tue, 10 Sep 2002 11:13:53 +010	0 (IST)\nReceived: from webr	\nReturn-Path: <bounce@trafficmagnet.com>\nDelivered-To: zzzz@localhost.jmason.org\nReceived: from localhost (jalapeno [127.0.0.1])\n\tby zzzzason.org (Postfix) with ESMTP id B09FC16F03\n\tfor <zzzz@localhost>; Tue, 10 Sep 2002 11:13:53 + note.net (mail.webnote.net [193.120.211.219]) by\n dogma.slashnull.org (8.11.6/8.11.6) with ESMTP id g89JZ0C29435 for\n <zzzz-list-admin-iiu@jmason.org>; Mon, 9 Sep 2002 20:35:05 +0100\nReceived: from localhost.localdomain ([211.101.236.180]) him (8.11.6/8.11.6) with ESMTP id\n g89JRj329191 for <zzzz-list-admin-iiu@jmason.org>; Tue, 10 Sep 2002 03:34:01 +0800 (CST)\nFrom: Sarah</zzzz-list-admin-iiu@jmason.org></zzzz-list-admin-iiu@jmason.org></zzzz@localhost></bounce@trafficmagnet.com>	
	Received, Received, Message-Id, Date, From, Reply-To, To, Subject, MIME-Version, X-Ema-Cid, X- Ema-Lid, X- Ema-PC,	on some search engines! I think to TrafficMagnet and the cost for su understand that you may NC TYPE="text/css">\n \nTD { f some search engines! I <BR \	we can\noffer you a service w ubmitting your website to over DT wish to receive information font-family: verdana, arial, helv I think we can offer \n\tyou a s \n\t \n\t <table width="</th"><th>Germa-Cid: 11513610\nX-Ema-Lid: \nX-Ema-PC: 0f02f9b386000\nContent-Type: multipart/alternative; boundary=1189366250.1031600041421.JavaMail.SYSTEM.emaserver2\nContent hich can help you increase traffic and the number of visitors to your website.\n\n\ would like to introduce you to TrafficMagnet.com. We offer a unique technology that will submit your \nwebsite to over 300,000 search engines and directories every montly 300,000 search \nengines and directories, visit us at:\n\nhttp://p1j2m3a4.pdhost.com/pdsvr/www/r?1000010979.505.23.eUcT DX PhW5zoln \n\n\n would love to hear from you. \n\n\nhest Regards,\n\nSarah Williams\nSales and Marketing \nE-mail: Sate from me by email. \nTo be removed from this and other offers, simply go to the link below:\nhttp://p1j2m3a4.pdhost.com/pdsvr/www/optoutredirect?UC=Lead&UI=11513610\n1189366250.1031600041421.JavaMail.SYSTEM.emaserver2\nContent-Type revices; font-size: 11px; color: #000000 \\n\n\n-\n\n-\n\n\nSTYLE>\n\n\HEAD>\n\nSDDY BGCOLOR="#FFFFF">\n\n\nTABLE WIDTH="600" BORDER="0" CELLPADDING="0" CELLPADDING="0"\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\</th></table>	Germa-Cid: 11513610\nX-Ema-Lid: \nX-Ema-PC: 0f02f9b386000\nContent-Type: multipart/alternative; boundary=1189366250.1031600041421.JavaMail.SYSTEM.emaserver2\nContent hich can help you increase traffic and the number of visitors to your website.\n\n\ would like to introduce you to TrafficMagnet.com. We offer a unique technology that will submit your \nwebsite to over 300,000 search engines and directories every montly 300,000 search \nengines and directories, visit us at:\n\nhttp://p1j2m3a4.pdhost.com/pdsvr/www/r?1000010979.505.23.eUcT DX PhW5zoln \n\n\n would love to hear from you. \n\n\nhest Regards,\n\nSarah Williams\nSales and Marketing \nE-mail: Sate from me by email. \nTo be removed from this and other offers, simply go to the link below:\nhttp://p1j2m3a4.pdhost.com/pdsvr/www/optoutredirect?UC=Lead&UI=11513610\n1189366250.1031600041421.JavaMail.SYSTEM.emaserver2\nContent-Type revices; font-size: 11px; color: #000000 \\n\n\n-\n\n-\n\n\nSTYLE>\n\n\HEAD>\n\nSDDY BGCOLOR="#FFFFF">\n\n\nTABLE WIDTH="600" BORDER="0" CELLPADDING="0" CELLPADDING="0"\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\	
	Content-Type] [Return-Path, Delivered-To, Received, Received, Received, From, Reply- To, Message-			5:15:14 2002\nReturn-Path: <claudia_robinson@eudoramail.com>\nDelivered-To: zzzz@localhost.example.com\nReceived: from localhost (localhost [127.0.0.1])\n\tby phobos.labs.example.com (Postfix) with ESMTP id 722F043F9B\n\tfor <zzzz@localhost< th=""></zzzz@localhost<></claudia_robinson@eudoramail.com>	
	ID, To, Subject, Date, 71 MiME-Version, Content-Type, X-Priority, X- MSMail- Priority, X- Mailer,	3db10ed5@qclywl>\nTo: <zzzz@ <math="" display="block">14.95. The sebrand newdomain \\.affordable-domains.com</zzzz@>	example.com>\nSubject: re: nextensionswererecently todayformoreinfo. \n\nl	Aug 2002 15:13:33 +0100 (IST)\nReceived: from eudoramail.com (c17996.rivrw4.nsw.optusnet.com.au [211.28.162.97])\n\tby webnote.net (8.9.3/8.9.3) with SMTP id UAA22962\n\tfor <zzzz@example.com>; Sun, 25 Aug 2002 20:36:12 +0100\nFrom: cdomain registration savings\nDate: Mon, 26 Aug 2002 06:30:21 -1100\nMiME-Version: 1.0\nContent-Type: text/plain;\n\tcharset="iso-8859-1"\nX-Priority: 3 (Normal)\nX-MSMail-Priority: Normal\nX-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)\nImportance the general public at discount prices. NewprovedbyICANNandhavethesamerightsastheoriginal. COMand. NETdomainnames. Thebiggestbene fitisof — coursethatthe. BIZand. INFOdomainnamesarecurrentlymoreavailable. i. e. itwillbemucheasier. Registeryourdomainnametodayforjust stration fees include full access to an easy-to-use control panel to manage your domain name in the future.\n \nSincerely,\n \nDomain Administrator\nAffordable Domains\n\n\nTo remove your email address from further promotional mailings from this co</zzzz@example.com>	
	Importance, Content- Transfer- Encoding] [Return-Path, Delivered-To, Received, Received,	Sep 2002 11:40:46 +0100 (IST)\ & SERVIC	nReceived: from cs.com (12- CES\nTo: "zzzz@jmason.org"	eturn-Path: <advertsprj40@cs.com>\nDelivered-To: zzzz@localhost.jmason.org\nReceived: from localhost (jalapeno [127.0.0.1])\n\tby zzzzason.org (Postfix) with ESMTP id 0948E16F03\n\tfor <zzzz@localhost>; Tue, 17 Sep 2002 11:40:46 +0100 (IS 245-142-206.client.attbi.com [12.245.142.206])\n by dogma.slashnull.org (8.11.6/8.11.6) with ESMTP id g8H9cKC04150 for\n <zzzz@jmason.org>\nSubject: May I have a moment of your Time PLEASE\nDate: Tue, 17 Sep 2002 05:40:44 -0400\nMIME-Version: 1.0\nContent/Type: Tue, 17 Sep 2002 05:40:44 -0400\nMIME-Version: 1.0\nContent/Type: Tue, 17 Sep 2002 05:40:44 -0400\nMIME-Version: 1.0\nContent/Vipe: Tue, 17 Sep 2002 05:40:40:40:40:40:40:40:40:40:40:40:40:40:</zzzz@jmason.org></zzzz@localhost></advertsprj40@cs.com>	
	Message-Id, 352 Errors-To, From, Organisation, To, Subject, Date, MIME-	Errors-To, From, Organisation, To, Subject, Date, MIME-Version, Late, MIME-Version, Content-Type] Errors-To, Subject, Date, MIME-Version, Content-Type] Errors-To, From, From, Draw place with J=\nohnson Home Products Online Store=2E All major Credit cards\naccepted=2E\n\nPlease visit us at!=20\nhttp://www=2Ejohnsonhome2276=2Ecom\n\nE-Coupon Numbers:\n\n\nMJ95L594568JWWL 5% off any order ! E-coupon Expires's 01/14/2003 =\nany order ! E-coupon Expires's 01/14/203 =\nany order ! E-coupon Expires's 01/14/203 =\nany order ! E-coupon Expires's 0			
	[Return-Path, Delivered-To, Received, Received, Received, Received, Received, Resage-Id, From, Reply-To, To, To, Date, Subject, X-Subject, X-Su				
	Priority, X- Mailer, MIME- Version, Content-Type, X-MIME- Autoconverted, Content- Transfer-	Mailer, MIME- Version, Content-Type, X-MIME- Autoconverted, Content- Autoconverted, Content-			
	Answer 1.1: We can see that spa	Answer 1.1: We can see that spam mails fearue a lot of cursive and bold letters, mainly in black and red. A reocurring theme is money. So yes, some of the mails are quite easy for us to classify. If given a big amount of test data a model could probably diferentiate spam from ham quite easily. Som of the indicators could be as written before, the color and type of text. Another indicator could be to look after some reoucurring words and phrase such as 'money', 'bitcoin' and such. Also looking at the content and determining wether all the words are in a common dictionary or not since			
In [19]:	1.2 Note that the email files contain a lot of extra information, besides the actual message. Ignore that for now and run on the entire text (in the optional part further down can experiment with filtering out the headers and footers). We don't want to train and test on the same data (it might help to reflect on why if you don't recall). Split the spam and the ham datasets in a training set and a test set. (hamtrain, spamtrain, hamtest, and spamtest). Use only the easy_ham part as ham data for quesions 1 and 2. from sklearn.model_selection import train_test_split				
	<pre>df_s = extract_e # join the two d df_combined_eh_s X = df_combined_</pre>	<pre>df_eh = extract_emails(['easy_ham'], 'eham') df_s = extract_emails(['spam'], 'spam') # join the two dataframes only for easy_ham and spam as instructions df_combined_eh_s = pd.concat([df_eh, df_s]) X = df_combined_eh_s['content'] y = df_combined_eh_s['class']</pre>			
	<pre># splitting training data, train size: 65%, test size: 35% hamtrain, hamtest, spamtrain, spamtest = train_test_split(X, y, train_size=0.65) # create new dataframes for each set' hamtrain = pd.DataFrame({'content': hamtrain, 'class': hamtrain}) hamtest = pd.DataFrame({'content': hamtest, 'class': hamtest}) spamtrain = pd.DataFrame({'content': spamtrain, 'class': spamtrain})</pre>				
	spamtest = pd.Da 2.1 Write a Py	thon program that: asets from Question 1 (hamt	mtest, 'class': spam	test})	
In [11]:	the email texts into v - Multinomial Naive I - Bernoulli Naive Bay	vectors. Please note that there	e are different types of Na	In and spamtrain, that classifies the test sets and reports True Positive and False Negative rates on the hamtest and spamtest datasets. Use CountVectorizer (Documentation here) to transform ive Bayes Classifier in scikit-learn (Documentation here). Test two of these classifiers that are well suited for this problem:	
	<pre>from sklearn.nai from sklearn.met from sklearn.nai from sklearn.met # cm labels categories= ["Sp</pre>	ve_bayes import Multinon rics import confusion_ma ve_bayes import Bernoul rics import accuracy_sc	mialNB atrix liNB ore		
	<pre>def spam_detecti vectorizer = hamtrain = v hamtest = ve</pre>	<pre>con_cm(hamtrain, hamtest countVectorizer() vectorizer.fit_transform ectorizer.transform(hamte er == 'MNB':</pre>	, spamtrain, spamtes (hamtrain)	t, categories, groupnames, cm_title, classifier):	
	<pre>elif classif model = else: raise Va # fit train</pre>	MultinomialNB() fier == 'BNB': BernoulliNB() fulueError("Invalid class. data into the chosen modulation, spamtrain)		hoose either 'MNB' or 'BNB'.")	
	print("Accur spam_test_pr	core in % model.score(hamtest, span racy of this model is: { model.predict(hamter) model.predict(hamter) model.predict(spantest, span	:.2f}%".format(accur	acy))	
	<pre>group_percen df_cm = pd.D sns.set_styl</pre>	<pre>cataFrame(cm, range(2), de("whitegrid", {'axes.gatmap(df_cm, annot=True, de(cm_title)</pre>	<pre>at(value) for value ; range(2)) rid' : False})</pre>	<pre>m.flatten()] in cm.flatten()/np.sum(cm)] ', xticklabels=categories, yticklabels=categories)</pre>	
In [12]:	<pre>ax.set_xlabe plt.show() df_ham_spam = pd # spam = 1 and h df_ham_spam.loc[</pre>	el("Predicted") I.concat([df_eh, df_s]) pam = 0 df_ham_spam['class'] ==			
	# create dataset hamtrain, hamtes spam_detection_c spam_detection_c	m(hamtrain, hamtest, sp	<pre>nd 35% test size = train_test_split(d amtrain, spamtest, c</pre>	f_ham_spam['content'], df_ham_spam['class'].values.tolist(), train_size=0.65) ategories, group_names, "Multinomial Naïve Bayes (easy ham)", 'MNB') ategories, group_names, "Bernoulli Naïve Bayes (easy ham)", 'BNB')	
	Mu	ultinomial Naïve Bayes (e		- 800	
	True	128	31	- 600 - 400	
	Наш	1	909	- 200	
	Accuracy of this	Spam Predicted model is: 92.14% Bernoulli Naïve Bayes (ea	Ham asy ham)		
	Spam	81	78	- 900 - 800 - 700	
	True			- 600 - 500 - 400 - 300	
	Наш	6	904	- 200 - 100	
		Predicted Predicted e following questions ountVectorizer do?	Ham S:		
	b) What is the difference	ence between Multinomial Nai	ive Bayes and Bernoulli Nees if a word (from trained	I dataset) exists (in test mail) or not (so it will give a value, 0 or 1), while Multinomial count the reoucurrance of each word, which normalized would be a value from 0 to 1. So it is reasonable (as the result above	
In [13]:	<pre>df_ham_spam = pd # spam = 1 and h</pre>	ne two models from Question and an and an	·	am. Does the performance differ compared to question 2 when the model was run on spam versus easy-ham? If so, why?	
	<pre>df_ham_spam.loc[# Create dataset hamtrain, hamtes spam_detection_c</pre>	m(hamtrain, hamtest, sp	<pre>'ham', 'class'] = 0 nd 35% test size = train_test_split(d amtrain, spamtest, c</pre>		
	Accuracy of this	model is: 91.63% ultinomial Naïve Bayes (h		- 160	
	Spam	170	7	- 140 - 120 - 100	
	Ham	15	71	- 80 - 60 - 40	
	Accuracy of this	Spam Predicted model is: 88.21%	Ham	- 20	
	B	Bernoulli Naïve Bayes (ha	ard ham)	- 160 - 140	
	True			- 120 - 100 - 80	
	Ham	31	55	- 60 - 40 - 20	
	Answer 3.1:	Spam Predicted	Ham	- 0 This is because this model is trying to detect spam in hard ham which is harder to differentiate from spam.	
In [14]:	3.2 Retrain Retrain new Multinon		s classifers on the combin	ed (easy+hard) ham and spam. Now evaluate on spam versus hard-ham as in 3.1. Also evaluate on spam versus easy-ham. Compare the performance with question 2 and 3.1. What do you observe?	
	<pre># spam = 1 and h df_ham_spam.loc[df_ham_spam.loc[</pre>	<pre>l.concat([df_h, df_s]) pam = 0 [df_ham_spam['class'] == [df_ham_spam['class'] == [ts with 65& train size and train size</pre>	'ham', 'class'] = 0		
	spam_detection_c spam_detection_c Accuracy of this	m(hamtrain, hamtest, sp	amtrain, spamtest, c amtrain, spamtest, c	f_ham_spam['content'], df_ham_spam['class'].values.tolist(), train_size=0.65) ategories, group_names, "Multinomial Naïve Bayes (easy+hard ham)", 'MNB') ategories, group_names, "Bernoulli Naïve Bayes (easy+hard ham)", 'BNB')	
	Spam	75	7	- 160 - 140 - 120	
	True			- 100 - 80 - 60	
	Наш	4 Spam	177 Ham	- 40 - 20	
	Accuracy of this	Spam Predicted model is: 88.97% noulli Naïve Bayes (easy		- 180 - 160	
	Spam	54	28	- 160 - 140 - 120 - 100	
	True	1	180	- 100 - 80 - 60 - 40	
	-	Spam Predicted	Ham	- 40 - 20	
		e combined model becomes lo		ned and tested on only easy ham but higher for the one tested with hard ham, for both classifiers. We are getting higher accuracy of the combined than the only hard ham because now we have a lot of mails that ined have less accuracy than the one trained and tested for easy ham because now we also have mails that are harder to detect as spam.	
	3.3 Further im Answer 3.3: The above models n	•	If we somehow inlcuded	more parameters to the model such as detect the letter colors, font style (bold and cursive) and look after emojis since this is recurring in spam mails (by experience). 😊 😜 🏟 😈 🅳 😂	